

REMARKS

These remarks are responsive to the Office communication dated April 18, 2005 and the non-final Office action dated June 7, 2004. In the Office communication of April 18, 2005, the Examiner states that the reply filed on February 3, 2005 is not fully responsive because applicants have not specifically set forth the patentable novelty of claims 22-26, particularly with respect to the Heintz reference. Furthermore, applicants are asked to clarify whether the claim terms "locking device" and "lock head" are positively recited or only inferentially claimed.

Applicant respectfully traverses these requirements. First, applicant specifically set forth the specific grounds for the patentable novelty of claims 22-26 in the reply filed November 5, 2004. Therefore, applicant believes that the reply of February 3, 2005 was fully responsive to the Office action of June 7, 2004 and Office communication of January 26, 2005. However, to expedite allowance of this application, a more detailed statement of the specific grounds for the patentable novelty of claims 22-26 is as follows. Claim 22 recites an apparatus including a housing having an access door permitting access to a cavity within the housing, a lens assembly substantially disposed within the housing, a lamp assembly substantially disposed within the housing, a slot extending through the housing, the slot sized and located to receive a lock head of a locking device, and a latch assembly disposed in the housing to permit the access door to be opened. Applicant believes that this combination of elements is not disclosed in any prior art reference of record, and is specifically not disclosed in the Heintz reference.

Furthermore, claims 23-26 depend from and include all of the elements of claim 22, and

are therefore patentably novel over the prior art of record, and specifically over Heintz, for at least this reason. Applicant believes that this is a sufficiently specific statement of the patentable novelty of claims 22-26 to fulfill the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.111.

Next, applicants respectfully decline to respond to the request regarding the locking device and lock head claim terms. These claim terms have not been rejected in any prior Office action. Therefore, it is improper to raise this issue in a Notice of an unresponsive reply. Furthermore, applicant believes that the claims are sufficiently clear as written.

Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance, in view of the above remarks. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE
TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted on May 13, 2005 via facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at (703) 872-9306.

Nicole Fye
Nicole Fye

Respectfully submitted,

ALLEMAN HALL McCOY
RUSSELL & TUTTLE LLP

M. Matthews Hall
M. Matthews Hall
Registration No. 43,653
Customer No. 50488
Of Attorneys for Applicants/Assignee
806 SW Broadway, Suite 600
Portland, Oregon 97205
Telephone: (503) 459-4141
Facsimile: (503) 459-4142